UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,219	02/14/2006	Anders Wieslander	05049.0007	6262
	7590 01/09/200 ENDERSON, FARAE	EXAMINER		
LLP	ŕ	DEAK, LESLIE R		
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3761	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/568,219	WIESLANDER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
LESLIE R. DEAK	3761		

	LESLIE R. DEAK	3761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 December 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extraction date of the structure of	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			oaase
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		. — , ,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.13	16 and 41.33(a)).		
4. $\square$ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. 🔲 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·	•	_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1.2.7-34.38-50. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	·	l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Leslie R. Deak/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3761	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The new claim listing is not entered, since it lists claim 48 as claim 8. Since the new claim listing is inaccurate, it has not been entered..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments do not overcome the obviousness rejection presented in the Final Rejection.

Applicant argues that Belotti '668 discloses an ampoule that creates a gas flow, and such an ampoule is not capable of holding gas for use at a later time. The Examiner agrees, and has relied on the disclosure in Belotti 668 that specifically teaches that the gas may be held in a syringe, which is capable of holding gas for a later expulsion. Applicant argues that Bellotti does not teach how such a substitution can be made. However, in an obviousness analysis, it is not necessary to find precise teachings in the prior art directed to the specific subject matter claimed because inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would employ can be taken into account. KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007). A basis to combine teachings need not be expressly stated in any prior art reference. In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 989 (Fed. Cir. 2006). There need only be an articulated reasoning with rational underpinnings to support a motivation to combine teachings. In re Kahn, 441 F.3d at 988..

Applicant further argues that Bellotti '668 does not disclose sterilization of the connection area before disconnection of the spent dialysis container. However, such a step is not clearly set forth in the pending claims.

Applicant argues that Bellotti does not disclose a filter arranged in the channel. It is the position of the Examiner that an open space that permits flow, such as that within the container that generates flow, comprises a channel. The prior art reasonably suggests the apparatus claimed by Applicant.

Applicant argues that claim 33 is allowable, since Bellotti fails to disclose the step of providing a flow of gas during connection and disconnection. It is the position of the Examiner that since Bellotti teaches the use of a syringe, which may hold sterile gas for later use, Bellotti reasonably suggests that sterile gas may be flowed during various steps of the connection and disconnection process.

Applicant's arguments fail to overcome the Final Rejection, which was necessitated by amendment.